

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COM-United States Patent and Trademark Offic Address & MMISSI OFFICE PATENTS AND TRAL Washington DC 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,283	07/10/2001	Chen-An Chen	3130/D1/TCG PMD/LE	8681
32588 75	90 11/06/2002			
APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.			EXAMINER	
SANTA CLAR.	LVD. M/S 2061 A, CA 95050		MACARTHUR, SYLVIA	
			ARTUNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1763	
			DATE MAILED: 11/06/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/902,283	CHEN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Sylvia R MacArthur	1763				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
Period for Reply	VIC OFT TO EVOIDE 2 MONTH	(S) FROM				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.						
Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3' after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this community. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) date to provide the provider of timely.	ays, a reply within the statutory minimum o	of thirty (30) days will				
 be considered timely. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuto communication. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, 	ry period will apply and will expire SIX (6) by statute, cause the application to become	me ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	2)					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·					
	his action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in the application						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdo	rawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊡ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claims are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner.						
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved.						
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of the CER 1. ☐ received.	TIFIED copies of the priority docu	ments have been:				
2. received in Application No. (Series C	ode / Serial Number)					
3. ☐ received in this National Stage application	ation from the International Burea	u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a I						
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for do	mestic priority under 35 U.S.C. &	. 119(e).				
Attachment(s)						
 15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No. 	19) Notice of Infor	nmary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) mal Patent Application (PTO-152) .				

nit: 1763

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

2. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9-13, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takamatsu et al (USP 6,155,540).

Takamatsu teaches an apparatus for vaporizing and supplying a material. The apparatus includes a vaporizer 9 wherein a liquid material for CVD is introduced, an ultrasonic atomizer 15 comprising an ultrasonic vibrator (comprising a sonic wave generator) 14. Two inlets for a carrier gas 17 are disposed at upper parts of the vaporizer. Each inlet for a carrier gas is disposed in the direction parallel with a plane perpendicular to the outlet of a vaporized gas.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

nit: 1763

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4,16, 17, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takamatsu in view of Micard (USP 4,684,104).

The teachings of Takamatsu were discussed above.

Takamatsu fails to teach a piezoelectric effect.

Micard discloses an electrically controlled valve with piezoelectric effect. A stack of piezoelectric ceramics (flexible plates) generally forms a piezoelectric element 14 of the conventional type. The element is clamped between the base plate 12 and the bottom wall 18 of a case 16 by a resilient pre-stressed element.

The motivation to utilize a piezoelectric means is that it is arranged for exerting on closure member (control valve) a percussion force for throwing said closure member from the first abutment position to the second abutment position upon application of an electrical voltage to said piezoelectric means and for throwing said closure member from the second abutment position to the first abutment position upon removal of said electrical voltage. Col.1 lines 23-46 disclose a controlled valve that is used as an actuator (opening/closing the valve to adjust flow).

Note that the piezoelectric effect generates waves to output a voltage signal.

Regarding claims 20 and 21, wherein the voltage signal is D.C. It would have been obvious to provide a D.C. voltage signal as the selection of type of voltage is from a limited number of choices A.C. or D.C.

Jnit: 1763

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention would have found it obvious to use the piezoelectric effect of Micard to promote flow of the fluids into vaporization regions of Takamatsu.

5. Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takamatsu in view of Nguyen et al (USP 5,925,189).

The teachings of Takamatsu were discussed above.

Takamatsu fails to teach trapping residue.

Nguyen discloses a liquid precursor delivery apparatus.

In col. 1 lines 26-28 Nguyen teaches that the injection valve is used for providing a processing gas to a CVD chamber. Fig.1 illustrates a basis injection valve to process chamber 12. A liquid container 14 uses a carrier gas through injection valve 18.

Nguyen recognizes the build-up of residue in an injection valve. Fig.4 illustrates a build-up of residue 82 around orifice 70.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would found it obvious to use the injection valve of Takamatsu in the liquid precursor delivery apparatus of Nguyen to the CVD chamber. Takamatsu provides optimal vaporization of a liquid source to the CVD apparatus of Nguyen.

Claims 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
 Takamatsu in view of Nguyen, in further view of Ketchum (USP 5,413,671).

 The teachings of Takamatsu and Nguyen were discussed above.
 Both fail to teach performing a cleaning process.

Page 5

nit: 1763

Ketchum teaches an apparatus provided for removing deposits, which accumulate within a continuous APCVD. Cleaning is performed in-situ. As wafers 16 enter chamber 12, thin film materials or dopant materials are directed upon wafer 16 via injector 18. Injector 18 receives vaporized material.

The motivation to combine the teachings of Takamatsu and Nguyen with those of Ketchum is to provide a cleaning process within the process chamber is to remove deposits of residue in-situ.

Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Takamatsu, Nguyen, and Ketchum to provide a cleaning process within a semiconductor processing system/

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sylvia R MacArthur whose telephone number is 703-306-5690. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F during the core hours of 8 a.m. and 2 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory L. Mills can be reached on 703-308-1633. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Jnit: 1763

Sylvia R. Mac Arthur November 4, 2002